IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

CHARLOTTESVILLE DIVISION

ELIZABETH SINES, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,	,) Civil Case No. 3:17-CV-00072)
vs.	,)
JASON KESSLER, et al.,))
Defendants.)

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC HEARING
HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOEL C. HOPPE PRESIDING
MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2019, 4:08 P.M.

Court Reporter: Judy K. Webb, RPR

210 Franklin Road, S.W., Room 540

Roanoke, Virginia 24011 (540)857-5100 Ext. 5333

Proceedings recorded FTR and transcribed using Computer-Aided Transcription

```
1
                        APPEARANCES
 2
   On behalf of Plaintiffs Elizabeth Sines, Seth Wispelwey,
   Marissa Blair, Tyler Magill, April Muniz, Hannah Pearce,
 3
   Marcus Martin, John Doe, Natalie Romero, and Chelsea Alvarado:
 4
                 Jessica E. Phillips, Esquire
                 Boies Schiller Flexner, LLP
 5
                 1401 New York Avenue, NW
                 Washington, DC 20005
 6
                 David E. Mills, Esquire
 7
                 Cooley LLP
                 1114 Avenue of the Americas, 46th Floor
 8
                 New York, NY 10036
 9
                 Michael Low Bloch, Esquire
                 Roberta Ann Kaplan, Esquire
                 Gabrielle E. Tenzer, Esquire
10
                 Kaplan Hecker & Fink LLP
11
                 350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7110
                 New York, NY 10118
12
13
   On behalf of Defendants Jason Kessler; Christopher Cantwell;
   Vanguard America; Robert Azzmador Ray; Nathan Damigo; Elliot
   Kline, also known as Eli Mosely; Identity Evropa; Matthew
14
   Heimbach; Matthew Parrott, also known as David Matthew
15
   Parrott; Traditionalist Worker Party:
16
                 James Edward Kolenich, Esquire
                 Kolenich Law Office
17
                 9435 Waterstone Blvd., Suite 140
                 Cincinnati, OH 45249
18
19
   On behalf of Richard Spencer:
20
                 John A. DiNucci, Esquire
                 Law Office of John A. DiNucci
21
                 8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1150
                 McLean, VA 22102
2.2
23
24
25
```

```
1
                     APPEARANCES cont'd
 2
   On behalf of Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and League of the
   South:
 3
                 Bryan Jeffrey Jones, Esquire
 4
                 Bryan J. Jones, Attorney at law
                 106 W. South Street, Suite 211
 5
                 Charlottesville, VA 22902
 6
 7
   On behalf of Jeff Schoep, National Socialist Movement,
   Nationalist Front:
 8
                 William Edward ReBrook, IV, Esquire
 9
                 The Rebrook Law Office
                 6013 Clerkenwell Court
10
                 Burke, VA 22015
11
12
   For James Stern:
13
                 James Stern, Pro Se
                 12625 Frederick Street, Suite I-5
14
                 Moreno Valley, VA 92553
15
16
   Also Present:
17
                 Brenton Vincenzes, Esquire
                 Jeff Schoep
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
         (Court convened at 4:08 p.m.)
 2
            UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Hello.
 3
            THE COURT: Hi. This is Joel Hoppe.
 4
            UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Hello.
 5
            THE COURT: Hello. This is Joel Hoppe.
 6
            UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Hello.
 7
            THE COURT: Hold on a second. I'm talking, okay?
 8
            This is Joel Hoppe. Who is on the line for the
 9
   plaintiffs?
10
            MR. BLOCH: Good afternoon, Judge. This is Michael
11
   Bloch from Kaplan Hecker & Fink on behalf of the plaintiffs.
12
   And I'm here with my colleague Gabrielle Tenzer.
13
            MR. ReBROOK: Hello, Judge. This is Edward ReBrook.
   I am the new attorney for the National Socialist Movement, the
14
15
   Nationalist Front, and Mr. Jeff Schoep. I'm being joined
16
   with --
17
            THE COURT: Are the plaintiffs --
18
            MR. ReBROOK: -- [indiscernible].
19
            THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. ReBrook. [Indiscernible]
20
   and Justin. All right.
21
            Is anybody else on the line for plaintiffs?
22
            MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, Your Honor.
23
            MS. KAPLAN: Yes, Your Honor.
24
            MS. PHILLIPS: This is Jessica Phillips from Boies
25
   Schiller Flexner, also for the plaintiff.
```

```
1
            MR. MILLS: And David Mills from Cooley.
 2
            MS. KAPLAN: And Roberta Kaplan is on as well, Your
 3
   Honor, but I'm deferring to my colleague Michael Bloch.
 4
            MR. STERN: And James Stern for the National
 5
   Socialist Movement. And this attorney -- my attorney just got
 6
   disconnected, but he's calling back in, Brenton Vincenzes,
 7
   who's going to be representing the National Socialist
 8
   Movement, that you ordered me to find an attorney for.
 9
            MR. ReBROOK: I'm sorry, this is again Edward
10
   ReBrook.
11
            THE COURT: Yeah, Mr. ReBrook --
12
            MR. ReBROOK: I am the attorney --
13
            THE COURT: -- stop.
            MR. ReBROOK: -- for the National Socialist
14
15
   Movement --
16
            THE COURT:
                        Mr. ReBrook, stop for a second, okay?
17
   Listen, I'm going to address this with y'all in a minute, but
18
   we're going to get to things in an orderly way.
19
            MR. ReBROOK: Understood.
20
            THE COURT: I'm just trying to see who is on the
21
   phone right now.
22
            MR. ReBROOK: All right.
23
            THE COURT:
                       There are a lot of people on the phone,
24
   and I'm going to ask for you to speak when it's your time.
25
   Okay?
```

```
1
            MR. ReBROOK: Understood. My apologies.
 2
            THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kolenich, are you on the
 3
   phone?
 4
            MR. KOLENICH: Yes, sir.
 5
            THE COURT: All right. And Mr. DiNucci?
 6
            MR. DiNUCCI: I'm here, Your Honor.
 7
            THE COURT: And, Mr. Jones, are you on the phone?
 8
            MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor.
 9
            THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Campbell?
10
        (No response.)
11
            THE COURT: All right. Now, are there any pro se
12
   defendants on the phone?
13
            MR. STERN: Yes, Your Honor, James Stern. You
   ordered me to get a lawyer for -- to go out of pro se.
14
15
            THE COURT: All right. And then, Mr. ReBrook, you're
16
   here for at least Mr. Schoep and the Nationalist Front.
                                                             And I
17
   understand that there is some disagreement --
18
            MR. ReBROOK: And the National Socialist Movement.
19
            MR. SCHOEP: I'm on the phone as well, Your Honor.
20
   This is Jeff Schoep, one of the defendants.
21
            MR. VINCENZES: Hello, can you guys hear me?
2.2
            THE COURT: Yes. Who just called in?
23
            MR. VINCENZES:
                           This is attorney Brent Vincenzes
24
   speaking.
25
            MR. STERN: For the National Socialist Movement.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: All right. Mr. Vincenzes, who are you
 2
   calling on behalf of?
 3
            MR. VINCENZES: I am -- so just to be clear, I am a
 4
   Virginia state bar licensed attorney. I am admitted to the
 5
   Eastern District. I am not admitted to the Western District
 6
   at this time; I can be, but I have not been retained yet.
 7
   I'm calling on behalf of Mr. Stern.
 8
            THE COURT: Mr. Stern is not a party to this lawsuit;
 9
   the National Socialist Movement is. So, Mr. Vincenzes, I
10
   think I provided instructions that if you wanted to
11
   participate you would have to be here in person to sit in, in
12
   the courtroom. So if you want to get admitted in this
13
   district and file a notice of appearance, you can do that;
   otherwise, you're not participating in this call. I'm not
14
15
   going to make you hang up, but -- you can listen in, but
   that's it. I think my instructions were pretty clear, and it
16
17
   sounds like they were not followed.
18
            MR. VINCENZES: I'm sorry? Not followed?
19
            THE COURT: That's right. It sounds like they were
20
   not followed.
21
            Mr. Vincenzes, when you file a notice of appearance
22
   and get admitted in this district, then I'll be happy to hear
   from you if you're representing a named party in the case,
23
24
   okay?
25
            MR. VINCENZES:
                            I'm sorry, I did -- I'm unclear.
```

```
1
   didn't mean to not follow the instructions. I was just --
 2
   received a phone call saying I could call in. But I can hang
 3
   up if you would like me to.
 4
            THE COURT: You can listen in -- you can listen in,
 5
   but that's it.
 6
            MR. VINCENZES: Okay. I won't say a word. That's
 7
   fine.
 8
                       And, Mr. ReBrook, I understand that
            THE COURT:
 9
   you've been admitted in this district at this time but you
10
   haven't filed a notice of appearance on behalf of any
11
   defendants. You need to --
12
            MR. ReBROOK: I just [indiscernible] --
13
            THE COURT: Hold on.
            MR. ReBROOK: -- [indiscernible] --
14
15
            THE COURT: Hold on.
16
            MR. ReBROOK: -- [indiscernible] --
17
            THE COURT: Mr. ReBrook. Mr. ReBrook, stop talking
18
   over me, all right?
19
            Listen, there are a lot of people on the phone. We
20
   have a number of things to address; we're going to do this in
21
   an orderly way. I'm going to listen to you, you're going to
   listen to me. That's how we have to do that in this district,
2.2
23
   okay?
24
            Now, you need to file a written notice of appearance.
25
   And every communication with the Court, and this goes for
```

```
1
   everyone, needs to be formal. If it's through an e-mail,
 2
   everyone needs to be copied on it. I won't tolerate any ex
 3
   parte -- any inappropriate ex parte communications from
 4
   anyone, and I want to be real clear about that going forward.
 5
            All right. Now, there are a number of things that we
 6
   need to address here today; first is attorney status. I think
 7
   we've gone over that for the most part.
 8
            We also need to get an update on discovery. And the
 9
   plaintiffs did send an e-mail, copying everyone in the case,
10
   providing an update about where things stand with the
11
   production of ESI and the defendants turning over devices and
12
   access to social media accounts.
13
            Mr. Bloch, is there -- is there anything additional
14
   to add to your report?
15
            MR. BLOCH: Judge, I don't think there's anything
16
   additional.
                I think the kind of two overarching concerns that
17
   we have that are sort of touched upon in the e-mail are,
   number one, there are obviously still some devices and
18
19
   accounts that have yet to be turned over.
20
            And number two is the appearance of a number of
21
```

And number two is the appearance of a number of additional social media accounts that have surfaced in various ways have kind of undermined our confidence that the stipulations that were signed and sworn by defendants are sort of entirely reliable and in terms of being able to have some confidence that we understand the entire universe of social

22

23

24

25

media accounts and devices that contain potentially responsive documents.

So the only thing that's sort of additional that I didn't mention in the e-mail is that I think it would be helpful for us to have new certifications from each party that kind of swears to a comprehensive list of social media accounts and devices that contain potentially responsive documents. I think it's clear at this point that the ones that were submitted in December are not entirely complete.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kolenich, there were -some of the plaintiffs' concerns about the completeness of the
certifications are directed to some of your clients.

Yeah, I'm thinking about how we do this in an orderly way so that I can hear from each party about -- about the completeness of the certifications, but also, we need to bring this portion of discovery to a close, and I want to do it -- I want to do it soon.

So, you know, Mr. Kolenich, I would like to hear from you now. It also may be that, you know, we need to move to a more formal motions practice at this time, too, so that if it's -- if your clients don't want to do updated certifications, that perhaps there can be a, you know, written -- written motion and then response on your part, and, you know, the client's -- you know, the client's signature indicating what has been provided and what hasn't and why.

```
1
   There may be a couple of ways to do this, but I do think we
 2
   need to -- we need to bring to this a conclusion.
 3
            Mr. Kolenich, what do you have to say?
 4
            MR. KOLENICH: No, I understand, Your Honor.
                                                           I think
 5
   that Mr. Bloch's take on this is a little, little bit over the
 6
   top for what's going on. We've been in communication with the
 7
   ESI vendor and they're aware of, you know, the status of
 8
   what's being mailed and when and, you know, why things are
 9
   being sent in piecemeal, and they haven't expressed any
10
   problems with that. So I'm not sure why Mr. Bloch is
11
   complaining on that particular issue.
12
            But if I could just go one by one, I think that's the
13
   only way this will make any sense to the Court.
14
            THE COURT:
                        All right.
15
            MR. KOLENICH: Mr. Parrott has mailed his stuff last
16
   week, and I have the FedEx or USPS number, whatever it is,
17
   tracking number provided to the ESI vendor, and his stuff
18
   should have arrived either today or tomorrow.
19
            Vanguard, I'll save them for last.
20
            Identity Evropa has sent the Discord authorization
21
   that Mr. Bloch requested, or that the plaintiffs requested.
22
            There are so many lawyers over there, I don't mean to
23
   blame you, Mr. Bloch.
                          Sorry.
24
            As far as I know, Identity Evropa is fully
25
   cooperative, and I want to underline that for the Court.
                                                               Most
```

```
of my clients are fully and enthusiastically cooperative with this. This is not some sort of willful disobedience to what's expected by the Court or by the plaintiffs. So especially Identity Evropa is enthusiastically cooperative. And this new Discord and these social media they are discussing were all post Charlottesville and contained next to nothing responsive to a discovery request. I know they're not going to take my guy's word for that, but that's where it is.
```

And that will -- you know, they're paying to find that out the long way, the hard way, whatever. That's fine. They'll have full and complete access to anything that IE has. And they already have the Discord release. This just wasn't something that -- since it didn't discuss Charlottesville, they didn't believe it was responsive or needed to be turned over, or the planning of Charlottesville.

Moving on to Mr. Ray. The ESI vendor is aware of why Mr. Ray's laptop -- you know, he uses that for work, so when he gets the first one back, he will send the second one in, you know, when he has a day that he cannot do his particular line of work.

This Gab, Kyrpto Report stuff, he doesn't have those pass codes. That's old stuff. He has the current Kyrpto Report password, so I'm not sure why they're saying that he hasn't provided that.

And as far as the comment section for the Daily

```
1
   Stormer website, I don't understand that. You know, the ESI
 2
   vendor did say that, that he said "does not remember."
 3
   that can't be accurate, because that's a thing that he uses
 4
   currently with his job. So I'll run down why the ESI vendor
 5
   is saying that. I have a call scheduled with them tomorrow,
 6
   and we'll see -- you know, we'll get that squared away.
 7
             THE COURT: And Mr. -- Mr. Kolenich, I'm sorry. For
 8
   Mr. Ray, the Discord, it looks like there are a couple of
 9
   Discord accounts that he doesn't have the password for. Does
10
   he have a password for any of them?
11
            MR. KOLENICH: It was my understanding that he does
12
   not, Your Honor, but I will circle back on that and make sure
13
   that I'm clear on what Ray is saying to the ESI vendor.
14
   order to be as efficient as possible, I had the clients, with
15
   the ESI vendor's permission, contact Ms. Kaitlyn Seely
    [phonetic] directly, and that was working. But as far as I
16
17
   know, she was squared away with Mr. Ray my last communication
   with her. I would like to, you know, have a day to speak with
18
19
   her, speak with Mr. Ray and see what the problem is with
20
   miscommunication.
21
            It can't be right that he doesn't have Daily Stormer
22
   pass codes for the media. The comment section, that's
23
   something he uses on a daily basis. That can't be accurate
24
   information.
25
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
```

2.2

MR. KOLENICH: Vanguard is a problem. Vanguard has not turned over the devices they were supposed to turn over and is not listening to counsel on the necessity of hurrying up and providing this stuff, so I really don't have anything to say in regard to them other than it might be useful for the Court to give them sort of a warning shot that, you know, you're not kidding, sanctions possible in this circumstance, and give them one last chance to comply.

The situation with Vanguard is they really don't exist anymore in any kind of a real sense. Obviously, they're in litigation and their officers are hanging on, trying to do their job in defending, but they don't want to be involved. And if their officers decide to just hang it up and leave the organization, I don't know who takes over at that point. There is a likely suspect.

But the current guy who I've been dealing with is kind of frustrated with it all and doesn't want to deal with it. So I think if the Court could send, you know, some sort of -- some sort of warning before actually imposing sanctions or making us go through motion practice, with Vanguard that might be useful to at least bring this to a conclusion that either he is or is not going to cooperate.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Well, you know, I have -- I have issued an order directing that the devices and account information be provided, and if it's -- and if you all

```
1
   agree, the plaintiffs' and Vanguard's counsel agree that it
2
   hasn't been done and that's clear, then, you know, it may be
 3
   time to, you know, issue a show cause and give them a certain
 4
   amount of time to be able to, you know, to rectify the
5
   violation of the order. And, you know, if they do it
 6
   within -- within that time, then perhaps the show cause order
7
   can be dismissed. But if there just hasn't been any attempt
8
   to comply with my order, then I do think we need to move
9
   forward.
10
            MR. KOLENICH: I can't say there has been, Your
11
   Honor. And the show cause order is sort of exactly what I was
12
   envisioning. I can't -- I can't deny that it had not been
13
   complied with. There's been no indication that I can give the
14
   Court that there's been any effort to comply on that one
15
   client.
                       Okay. All right. Mr. Kolenich, anything
16
            THE COURT:
17
   else to report on those clients?
18
            MR. KOLENICH: I think the only other thing is I
19
   already have the supplemental ESI declarations from Parrott
20
   and Kessler. Those are the only ones the plaintiffs asked me
   for, so, you know, if they wanted a global one, it's news to
21
2.2
        They didn't mention that before. Other than that,
23
   nothing else, Your Honor.
24
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. And, Mr. Jones, how
25
   about for Hill and Tubbs? It looks like there -- there may be
```

a few things outstanding for them as well.

MR. JONES: Yeah. They have all their devices sent in, but plaintiffs have notified me of some new accounts that were not turned over. Both Hill and Tubbs have said that a new recreated post Charlottesville sent them significantly after Charlottesville [indiscernible] is there. But they said they didn't have any responsive information on it. But I'm happy to have them sign a new stipulation and get that sent out here in the next day or two.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And, Mr. ReBrook, it looks like Mr. Schoep is also mentioned in this -- in the e-mail. Have you -- have you seen the e-mail from plaintiffs' counsel? Do you know what I'm talking about?

MR. ReBROOK: I'm not certain what you're referring to, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So this is an e-mail that was sent to -it's all of the -- all of the attorneys of record in the case
today, and it -- what it says for Mr. Schoep is that -- this
is talking about providing devices and social media account
credentials to a third-party vendor.

What it says is that: Although Defendant Schoep provided his cell phone to the vendor on March 11th, the vendor was unable to obtain any information from the device due to water damage, as Mr. Schoep reported that the phone had fallen in a toilet last year.

```
1
            Do you have any response on that, or any additional
2
   information?
 3
            MR. ReBROOK: I know that he mentioned the same thing
 4
   to me prior to retaining me on this matter, that he had
5
   dropped his phone in the toilet at some point. And I'm under
 6
   the impression that he has turned over that phone, as well as
 7
   the other things that have been demanded in the discovery
8
   request, to the third-party vendor.
9
            THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bloch, having heard from
10
   defendants' counsel, what are your -- what do you propose at
11
   this point?
12
                        Thank you, Judge. I think I understood
            MR. BLOCH:
13
   with respect to Vanguard America.
14
            I think with respect to the other defendants who seem
15
   to still have outstanding materials, including Mr. Ray and
16
   Mr. Parrott, as well as Mr. Hill and Mr. Tubbs, I think it
17
   feels to us that the warning shots have already been sort of
18
   issued, and it seems to me to make sense, at least with
19
   respect to each of those people, that something along the
20
   lines of the order to show cause might be appropriate for them
21
   as well.
            THE COURT: It sounds like there's a fair amount of
2.2
23
   compliance, and also some disagreement about whether certain
24
   accounts, you know, really are relevant or they're responsive,
25
   and that -- and so, you know, with that in mind what I
```

```
1
   would -- what I would think would be necessary is this:
 2
   you feel like the responses that you've received and the
 3
   information that's been provided to the vendor is insufficient
 4
   at this point that -- you know, once you feel like you've
 5
   reached that point that it would really be incumbent upon the
 6
   plaintiffs to file a motion to compel and allow the defendants
 7
   to file formal responses on, you know, on each of the items so
 8
   that I can see exactly what each party's position is on it,
   and then we'll move -- this has been outstanding for some
10
          We'll move quickly and definitively on the -- I don't
11
   know that there's -- I don't think there's anything really
12
   complicated at this point.
13
            It's just a question of whether -- whether things
14
   should, you know, should be turned over or not; and if they
15
   haven't, then, you know, why not? But I think that would
   probably be the way, way to go for it. I don't think that --
16
   I don't think that just issuing a show cause when there's
17
18
   some -- some dispute, and, you know, at least a pretty good
19
   amount of compliance, I don't know that that's appropriate at
20
   this time.
21
            MR. BLOCH: Understood, Judge. Just a couple points
22
   of clarification. One is, I think it would be our position
23
   that each of these things have previously been compelled by
24
   Your Honor by force of the order in November.
```

It's hard for me to tell whether there's disagreement

25

at this point about -- and obviously we can meet and confer again with defendants on this point if necessary. But it's not clear to me that there's disagreement on certain things; including, for example, things like where defendants have not -- don't remember passwords and things like that, it would be our position that they ought to sort of take steps to recover passwords, which in my experience isn't, isn't such a difficult task, and turn it over. And the same thing with Mr. Ray's laptop, for example. It sounds like -- it's not clear to me that that -- that there's a sort of principled position to withhold some of these things.

So I guess one -- one point of clarification we're wondering about is whether it's appropriate to move to compel to the extent there's just a disagreement on these issues or whether just to move for sanctions at this point.

THE COURT: I think you could do it either way.

You're moving to compel or moving for the Court to issue a show cause. I just don't think that I'm in a position, with the information in front of me right now, to just go ahead and issue a show cause order. So I think there are a couple ways you can do it; it all gets to the same result.

MR. BLOCH: Okay. The other just one -- the other thing I think may be worth clarifying is there may be a point of disagreement where I think defendants have -- it sounds like they have withheld certain accounts and potentially

```
1
   devices on grounds that they were -- I guess, probably mainly
2
   accounts, that they were created after the events in
 3
   Charlottesville.
 4
            It's our position, and I think it's fairly clear,
5
   that merely because an account was created after
 6
   Charlottesville, it doesn't make it nonresponsive,
 7
   particularly when they comment on the events that took place
   in Charlottesville. And I think that applies certainly -- I
9
   think with all of the accounts that we have identified, but
10
   particularly the identity of Ropus [phonetic] servers were
11
   all -- a lot of them were created beyond the date of the
12
   incident in this case, but they still contain responsive
13
   materials. And I'm not -- I don't know if there's
14
   disagreement on that point, but it does sound like that's the
15
   basis that a number of things have been withheld.
16
            THE COURT: I'm sure that accounts created after
17
   August 2017 could hold responsive documents, so that's
18
   something that if it hasn't been discussed before, it
   certainly should be discussed by counsel. And if there is --
19
20
   if there is some disagreement that, you know, the parties
21
   are -- are insisting on and their positions are firm, then I
2.2
   think you need to move forward with a formal motion.
2.3
            All right. Mr. Bloch, anything else on the discovery
24
   issues?
25
            MR. BLOCH: The only other thing, Judge, I think is
```

2.2

we did -- and I appreciate defense counsel will be providing additional certifications for the various specific accounts that we asked about. I do think it would be helpful for each party to submit an updated, comprehensive certification.

I think the ones that we -- you know, we've been sort of chasing this down one by one. As an account pops up, you know, we've been reaching out to defendants to try to confirm that, in fact, it is the defendants' account. And so far, you know, our list is up to six, six defendants who we've found additional accounts for. I suspect there may be more. But it's becoming a cumbersome process to keep track of, and I guess -- I guess I'm specifically asking of defendants whether they would do that for each party so that we can have a -- we can understand the baseline that we're operating from going forward.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kolenich, you indicated that Mr. Parrott and Mr. Kessler have updated their certifications. Now, for your other clients, is that something that you're willing to do? It seems reasonable when there have been a number of new devices and accounts that have surfaced through this process.

MR. KOLENICH: Your Honor, that certainly seems reasonable for the stuff we know about. I mean, at some point -- you know, outside this litigation, I have clients who have dozens of Gmail, Hotmail accounts, most of which are

defunct, they don't use, and if asked to certify, they would just not know, they would forget it, they don't have the password.

I personally tried to recover an old Hotmail password, I can't do it, on an account of mine that hasn't been used for some years.

Mr. Bloch and the entire plaintiffs, true, are attempting to litigate this case to a point of sanctions on discovery instead of, you know, what's reasonable for my clients. It's not reasonable [indiscernible] know we're going to do one declaration, another declaration, another declaration. There's no way for them to know. They are not corporations, they do not have IT people, there's no way for them to know the entire universe of social media they're using.

IE has already provided the Discord release. Of course they knew they were using that. That's a mistake by them. It won't happen again. It's a misunderstanding; that's all it was.

Kessler and Parrott forgot about these rarely used accounts. I got their supplemental decs; I will provide them today at some point. But -- and this is directed not so much to the Court as to the plaintiffs' attorneys: There is no way that they could possibly know every last social media account that they ever appeared on, whether before or after

2.2

Charlottesville. So to some extent, these declarations are not, you know, getting at a legitimate effort to get all, you know, the full universe of this [indiscernible] information.

That said -- and I hope the Court understands that I'll provide declarations from my clients, you know, however many declarations they want -- it's not going to solve this problem. It is never going to solve the problem, or there's no way to know how many different social media accounts they were on two years ago or last year, or what they've got going on now that they consider a complete side issue that may or may not contain the word "Charlottesville."

So I think that we need to get through the CSI process, we need to get what's on the main device that these guys use, and then we need to have a fair analysis of the fact that they either do or do not have a case. This process has to come to an end. They're not entitled to discover every last syllable my men typed into the Internet ever, you know, thread that may have contained the word "Charlottesville."

That's abusive and simply not provided by the civil rules.

But I will confer with them, and I will cooperate fully and enthusiastically in getting them whatever satisfies them in the way of these declarations.

And again, that's aside from Vanguard. Vanguard richly deserves the order to show cause; I can't say otherwise.

1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MR. BLOCH: Judge -- sorry. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Bloch. 4 MR. BLOCH: If I may briefly, Judge. Mr. Bloch. 5 Obviously, all we're asking for is what was called for in the 6 certifications and order by the Court, which is, you know, not 7 every social media account that each party had, but just 8 social media accounts that contained potentially responsive 9 documents in the litigation. 10 And the additional social media accounts that we have 11 identified I think we were careful to -- to the extent we had 12 any access to any part of it, we were careful to try to 13 determine whether or not they were not only accounts that 14 belonged to the parties, but whether they contained 15 potentially responsive documents, and only raised with the 16 defendants or with the Court accounts that seemed to fall in 17 those categories. 18 And so, you know, I certainly think that defendants 19 should be held to the standard that is called for in the 20 certifications, which is to certify under oath which of the 21 social media accounts that they had and used that contained 22 potentially responsive documents, which is the only way by 23 which, you know, we can sort of move forward with the vendor 24 in determining what is the universe of responsive documents

out there. So I'm only asking for certifications from each

25

2.2

party that fall in that -- you know, under that definition.

THE COURT: All right. And, you know, these certifications, I mean, this is a -- it's an involved and extensive process using the third-party vendor, so all of the parties who are signing certifications need to do their very best to get the information right in the first instance.

This is also a discovery process, and every party has a duty to supplement, and, you know, your investigations have to be reasonable. So if there are things that don't turn up on the first instance and there's a good reason why they didn't, the rules require, you know, a timely supplement, and so that's how I'm viewing these certifications. It's not a -- you know, it's not a trap to set up sanctions, but everybody needs to be doing their best to provide, you know, the information that's available to them that's relevant.

MR. KOLENICH: Jim Kolenich, Your Honor. It's just going to continue going around in that circle. It's my client's position that this new stuff is nonresponsive, not necessarily the IE, but the other two. You know, they wouldn't have been included. Even if they had been fully informed by their lawyer, they would have still taken the position it's not responsive.

So, I mean, we're going to file the certification. We've given them the pass codes for this new stuff. Several of my clients are fully wide open and cooperative to any

electronic discovery, but, you know, they're saying, well, we just want what -- you know, we want to pin down the universe of responsive documents.

They have a lot of social media that, by and large, is nonresponsive, and it's just never going to end with the plaintiff saying, "We found this one. We found that one. We found another one." I'm sure there's 500 other social media accounts out there, but most of them are defunct, unused, or my guys [indiscernible]. We just can't provide it, and at some point it would be nice if the plaintiffs would admit to that fact.

And, you know, take this Discord release. All of it is already on the Internet, but they're going to come at us like we have some information that's not already out there. It's out there. It's full and complete on that Unicorn Riot website. There isn't anything else to get, but they're going to make a big deal, like, "Well, we need a certification. We need this. We need that." Okay. And they have it already. We have already complied with that. I just, I would like the Court to know that there is no obfuscation going on on our part.

MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, if I may respond to that. This is Ms. Kaplan. That is not even close to being an accurate description of the record here.

We are over a year into this case, Your Honor, and we

```
1
   have seen problem after problem after problem with trying get
 2
   any discovery from these defendants. The Discord release he's
 3
   talking about we only know about because some people hacked
 4
   into Discord and disclosed additional channels that defendants
 5
   never told us about in this case, never disclosed, never said
 6
   a word about. And they now say, "Oh, we should just rely on
 7
   what the hackers did because it's all now out there."
 8
            This process has been, with all respect, Your Honor,
 9
   a farce. And we're not trying to get every document that
10
   defendants have. We're trying to get every bit of information
11
   that still exists, that wasn't thrown in a toilet, that
12
   relates to Charlottesville. And if they wrote about
13
   Charlottesville after Charlottesville, it's relevant. You
   already said that, Your Honor. It's not something to dispute.
14
15
            So we will do a motion, but we really think that at a
16
   certain point fines have to be implemented of $100 or more a
17
   day against each defendant, including Identity Evropa, who has
18
   already -- whose counsel has conceded are in contempt for
19
   failing to comply with the Court's orders.
20
            And I apologize for raising my voice, Your Honor, but
   it is just shocking to hear this. Mr. Kolenich is just
21
2.2
   talking as if he's been cooperating in this case for the past
23
   16 months. We have nothing.
24
            THE COURT: All right.
25
            MR. DiNUCCI: Your Honor, can we go --
```

```
1
            MS. KAPLAN:
                         We take Your Honor's directions and we
 2
   will submit a motion.
 3
            THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. DiNucci, I haven't asked to
 4
   hear from you. Is there anything that you want to weigh in
 5
   on?
 6
            MR. DiNUCCI: Yes, Your Honor. With respect to
 7
   compliance about an alleged affair to disclose accounts, this
 8
   is the first I heard of this, assuming these remarks were even
 9
   addressed to Mr. Spencer. I haven't heard his name mentioned
10
   once.
11
            The report I saw this morning only fleetingly, as I
12
   was getting ready for an appearance in the Eastern District,
13
   didn't indicate any problems with Mr. Spencer. So I don't
   know -- I mean, I'm assuming, but I shouldn't do that, that
14
15
   none of these prior remarks have anything to do with my
16
   client. If they do, I'm not aware that anything has not been
   withheld that was supposed to have been disclosed. Nobody has
17
18
   said a single thing, let alone a specific thing about my
19
   client.
20
            THE COURT:
                       I think the spreadsheet --
21
            MR. DiNUCCI: I'm trying to --
2.2
                       I think the spreadsheet that the
            THE COURT:
23
   plaintiffs submitted, it looked like Mr. Spencer had turned
24
   over just about everything, and that I didn't see any problems
25
   there.
```

```
1
            Mr. Bloch, are you aware of any problems with
 2
   Mr. Spencer's production?
 3
            MR. BLOCH: I'm not, Judge.
 4
            MR. DiNUCCI:
                          If I may also add, Your Honor, I
 5
   actually got an e-mail this morning from Ms. Vila in which she
 6
   indicated that they're having problems doing a search of my
 7
   client's e-mails because of the breadth of the search on
 8
   account of one of the search terms provided by plaintiffs'
 9
   counsel was the name Richard B. Spencer.
10
            I've been informed that they have found 153,000
11
   e-mails with that, and they're looking for me, but I've got to
12
   talk to opposing counsel for guidance on how to narrow that so
13
   that we're not going beyond needs proportional to that, or --
14
   you know, this is becoming disproportional to the needs of the
15
   case.
         153,000 e-mails. God forbid I should have to --
16
            MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, I'm quite --
17
            MR. DiNUCCI: [Indiscernible].
18
            MS. KAPLAN:
                          I'm quite -- Your Honor, I'm quite
19
   confident that with all e-mail productions we gave search
20
   terms that are connected, so, obviously, we're not asking for
21
   anything -- any e-mail that has "Spencer" on it. We're
   looking at e-mails that have "Spencer" with various terms, all
2.2
23
   of which --
24
            MR. DiNUCCI: All I can say is that's what I was
25
   told --
```

```
1
            MS. KAPLAN: -- either Mr. Spencer's attorney --
 2
            MR. DiNUCCI: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
 3
            MS. KAPLAN: -- either Mr. Spencer's attorney or the
 4
   vendor doesn't appreciate. That, I'm sure, can be cleared up.
 5
   But that's obviously not what we're asking for.
 6
            MR. DiNUCCI: No, I appreciate what you're saying,
 7
   Ms. Kaplan, but I'm simply relaying what Ms. Vila told me this
 8
   morning. I would be happy to forward the e-mail to you.
 9
            THE COURT: That's probably something to follow up
10
   on, because I can't imagine the plaintiffs would put that as a
11
   search term. That would certainly be overbroad. All right.
12
                       Your Honor, I have relevant information
            MR. STERN:
13
   regarding the discovery. Since you ordered me on the 1st of
14
   March to sign binding -- or IES to be able to be the vendor on
15
   the National Socialist Movement, we have actually -- my team
16
   has actually went into three social media accounts that I'm
17
   sure that wasn't disclosed, that we found shocking
18
   information. You have National Social -- you have NSM88.org,
19
   you have NSMradio.org, and you have NSMmedia.org. And you
20
   have Commander@newsects.org, which is the personal e-mail that
   Jeff -- the former commander was using for the National
21
   Socialist Movement.
2.2
23
            The information that we've gone through and saw in
24
   these accounts, some of it clearly identified actions of
25
   Charlottesville that was commented on in a very negative way
```

of saying things that were -- I would assume the plaintiff would want.

Now, I signed the document as you ordered, Your Honor, for them to be able to get access to stuff, but I have not been in communication with anybody about the other e-mails and the other social media cites that we found that do exist for the National Socialist Movement. And so the attorney that I hired said he would actually take the time to make sure that, you know, this information is disseminated at the proper time, you know, if he's allowed to be able to substitute in.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Stern, I didn't see that the plaintiffs' e-mail and the spreadsheet, I don't think it identified anything specific about the National Socialist Movement, so that's why I haven't addressed any issues about it.

But in general, without getting too granular on the discovery, you know, I do think that it's certainly time that if there are specific things that are outstanding, that all those be identified, you know, in a formal motion, if they're -- and then have the defendants respond to each item. And, you know, we're going to -- I think we need to bring it to a close.

Another thing that I had flagged to discuss today is the case schedule going forward. And I don't know that it makes as much sense to address that today since some of the

2.2

discovery is still -- is still somewhat up in the air. And I don't know whether you all have a good sense for what the new case deadlines would be at this point, how much more time you think you would need for the third-party vendor to complete its process and have the defendants review documents and provide them and schedule depositions.

But, Mr. Bloch, do you have a sense of that at this point or is that premature?

MR. BLOCH: Judge, I think I agree with you that it's premature at this point. I actually did speak to the vendor about 20 minutes before the call, and that was, frankly, her sense too, was that it's difficult for her to even provide a kind of remotely accurate estimate, in part because -- because of the accounts and devices that are still outstanding, and in part because the actual collection of social media accounts in particular I think is particularly cumbersome for them. So I think I share your sense that it may be premature at this point and maybe makes more sense for us to schedule another call in the next few weeks when we may have a better estimate.

THE COURT: I think that's right, and I don't want this to get too far along before putting a schedule in place, but I also want to get one that's going to work. So we will take that up at a status conference in the next couple weeks, certainly within a month.

All right. You know, I think there is one lingering

issue about attorney status, and that's for the National Socialist Movement.

Mr. ReBrook, I understand that you're intending to enter an appearance on behalf of that entity.

And, Mr. Stern, I understand that you're in the process of hiring a lawyer, who is on the phone at this time, to enter an appearance behalf of that entity as well.

And I just want to say this: that, you know, you all -- it seems like there's some dispute about who controls NSM, and that is just a sideshow to this case. It doesn't have anything to do with this case, and, you know, I don't want it playing out in this case.

The only thing that is -- that we really need for purposes of this case is a person who at this time is entitled to -- you know, to direct operations of NSM, whatever those operations are. And so whoever that person is, and y'all may be fighting that out in another court, but whoever it is at this time is the person who can hire counsel to have that -- have an attorney represent NSM.

MR. STERN: Your Honor, on that -- this is James

Stern, Your Honor. On that note there, for clarity, can we -can both parties who claim to own or have control of the NSM

submit to you respectfully any documentation that shows they
have control of the organization? That way you can make a

respected decision of saying who you're going to accept

```
1
   decisions from at this point.
 2
            MR. SCHOEP: Your Honor, if I may interject. This is
 3
   Jeff Schoep. I'm the incorporator of the National Socialist
   Movement. I had been running the organization for the last 27
 4
 5
   years. Basically, Mr. Stern is trying to turn this into his
 6
   15 minutes of fame, and a circus sideshow in the courtroom --
 7
            THE COURT: Look, I'm not going to -- I'm not going
 8
   to have anybody turn it into a sideshow, and that's right
   where we're going right now. So, yeah, I'm -- you know, I'm
10
   not inclined to, you know, to rule on this issue.
                                                       I mean,
11
   that is just -- it is a -- that is an issue for a separate
12
   court to decide.
13
            Neither of you can represent NSM yourselves, so I'm
   not going to hear from either of you on, you know, who is --
14
15
   who is operating or who is trying to control it. You can have
   an attorney enter -- enter an appearance and we'll take it
16
17
   from there. But, you know, there's no pro se representation
18
   of this entity and so --
19
            MR. STERN: Okay. So we just -- so I can be clear --
20
            THE COURT: -- I think we're done on that.
21
            MR. STERN: So I can be clear, we can have an
22
   attorney to enter an appearance, and then you guys -- between
23
   you and the attorneys, you guys will discuss it, work that
24
   out? Is that correct, Your Honor?
25
            THE COURT: That will be the first step. But who
```

```
1
   controls this entity is -- I don't see that there's any
 2
   federal jurisdiction for that, for that issue; it is a side
 3
   issue. Now, it may have to be resolved for purposes of this
   case who is going to, you know, exercise control over it, but
 4
 5
   that's something I'm going to take up another day if I have
 6
   to.
 7
            MR. STERN:
                        This case is going on right now in state
 8
   court about that, Your Honor, so you're right. I agree with
 9
   you.
10
            THE COURT: All right. Is there anything
   else from the plaintiffs' perspective that we need to take up
11
12
   today?
13
            MR. BLOCH: Judge, just to clarify, because we will
14
   be, obviously, needing to reach out to whoever represents NSM,
15
   and particularly the accounts that Mr. Schoep -- that
   Mr. Stern just mentioned I think were not on the original
16
17
   certification, so that will probably be my first order of
18
   business with them. Is there a -- a timeline by which some --
19
   some attorney needs to enter a notice of appearance on behalf
20
   of NSM, and Nationalist Front for that matter?
21
            THE COURT: Yeah. It was set out in my order. It's
22
   today. And that will be, you know, part of the show cause
23
   order, if there hasn't been a notice of appearance entered on
24
   behalf of Nationalist Front and NSM. Today is the deadline.
25
            MR. BLOCH: Your Honor --
```

```
1
            MR. SCHOEP: Your Honor, this is Jeff Schoep again,
 2
   and my attorney is on the line. And I have the state
 3
   incorporation papers and everything else that's needed, so
 4
   anything that you guys need as far as, you know, evidence on
 5
   that, you know, my attorney can outline that. And it's very
 6
   clear on the state incorporation web sites and all, and
 7
   everything else -- you know, web sites and everything else
   who's --
 8
 9
            THE COURT: He can -- he can -- he can file what he
10
   needs to after he has noted his appearance.
11
            MR. SCHOEP: Understood.
12
            MR. ReBROOK: Your Honor, this is Edward ReBrook, if
13
   I may.
14
                       Sure. Go ahead.
            THE COURT:
15
            MR. ReBROOK: I have gone through the process to sign
   up for the ECF within the Western District. I have not yet
16
17
   received my log-in information for that. And it's rather late
18
   in the day; it's about 5:00 o'clock. I would absolutely
19
   comply with the Court and submit my notice of appearance if I
20
   were fittedly able to do so. But I defer to the Court's
21
   judgment on how you wish for me to proceed.
22
            THE COURT: I'll make sure the clerk's office knows
23
   about that.
24
            MR. ReBROOK: Thank you, Your Honor.
25
            MR. STERN: Your Honor, one question -- a request.
```

```
1
   Today is the 18th, the day that you required us to have
   counsel for the corporation. The fact that we have -- I have
2
 3
   shown good faith that I've been fighting for this
 4
   organization, and the fact that I have actually spoke to
 5
   counsel to have counsel to substitute in, can I ask the Court
 6
   to give me five days to be able to have this attorney to have
7
   the certifications to complete? That way we can -- he can
8
   make his appearance? Can I ask for that, for five days?
9
            I do -- Your Honor, just so you know, I have actually
10
   stopped my life trying to make sure I comply with the Court,
11
   make sure everything that the plaintiffs are asking for. And,
12
   you know, as I said, I would just ask for the consideration of
13
   just five days so I can make sure the attorney that we do have
14
   that wants to do it can make his appearance properly.
15
            THE COURT: Mr. Stern, the attorney that you've been
16
   speaking with, you've obviously made steps towards that, and
17
   he's on the phone and hopefully in the process of getting
18
   admitted in the district so that he can file a notice of
19
   appearance. So, you know, I'll give you until the end of the
20
   week on that.
21
            MR. STERN: Thank you. And one other quick question.
22
   Does the Court want me to submit any of the state attorney
23
   general's criminal investigation on this case?
24
            THE COURT:
                        No. No. You may not submit anything.
25
   You are not representing NSM.
                                  You can have an attorney do
```

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al. - 3/18/19

```
1
   that, and you have until Friday.
 2
            MR. STERN: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you.
 3
            THE COURT: All right. All right, Mr. Bloch, is
 4
   there anything else?
 5
            MR. BLOCH: Judge, I think that's it. That's it from
 6
   the plaintiffs. Thank you.
 7
            THE COURT: Mr. Kolenich?
 8
            MR. KOLENICH: Nothing further, Your Honor.
 9
            THE COURT: Mr. DiNucci?
10
            MR. DiNUCCI: Nothing further, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Mr. Jones?
11
12
            MR. JONES: Nothing further, Your Honor.
13
            THE COURT: All right. Anything from anybody else?
14
        (No response.)
15
            THE COURT: Okay. All right, well thank you and have
16
   a good day.
17
            UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Thank you, Your Honor.
18
            UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: Thank you, Judge.
19
        (Court recessed at 5:00 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al. - 3/18/19

```
1
                              CERTIFICATE
 2
   I, Judy K. Webb, certify that the foregoing is a
 3
   correct transcript from the record of proceedings in
   the above-entitled matter.
 4
 5
 6
                            Date: 3/20/2019
   /s/ Judy K. Webb
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```